

Applicant : **Nhon Quach et al.**
Serial No. : **To Be Assigned (Continuation of 09/608,959)**
Filed : **Concurrently Herewith**
Page No. : **13**

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 14, and 16 through 20, and 22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11 and 17 are the independent claims. Claims 1 through 7, 9 through 14, 17 through 20 have been amended. Claims 15 and 21 have been withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 4 through 6 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, and 8 through 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Godiwala et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,267). The Examiner has rejected claims 17 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Godiwala et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,267).

DRAWING CHANGES

Filed concurrently herewith are formal drawings, which were previously submitted and approved in the parent case.

SPECIFICATION CHANGES

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct the reference numbers assigned to the elements in FIGs. 1 and 2, and to make correct minor grammatical and formatting corrections. No new matter has been added.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection of original claim 3 is incorrect, since "EDSM" has proper antecedent basis in claim 2 from which it depends. Claim 7 has been amended to now recite: "The apparatus of claim 5, wherein the result latch is further to transmit the polarized signal to the error detection component." Therefore, the

Applicant : Nhon Quach et al.
Serial No. : To Be Assigned (Continuation of 09/608,959)
Filed : Concurrently Herewith
Page No. : 14

rejection of claim 7 is now also believed to be moot, since the “error detection component,” “result latch,” and “polarized signal” have their antecedent bases in claim 5, from which claim 7 now depends. Accordingly, Applicants believe the above remarks and amendments have rendered the rejection of claims 3 and 7 moot and respectfully request the Section 112 rejection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, and 8 through 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godiwala et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,361,267). Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

an error detection component to control the detection of errors in information stored in a processor resource between stores of new information in the processor resource; and

a comparison component coupled to the error detection component, the comparison component to receive the information from the processor resource, to determine whether the information is valid, and to output a signal to indicate an error condition, if the information is invalid.

As the Examiner states, “Godiwala et al., teaches (col. [3, lines] 35-38) a computer system where all read transactions are checked for errors and upon recognition of such errors, the errors are promptly reported to the processor.” (See Office Action, page 3, paragraph 4.) However, the system in Godiwala et al. only operates on information as the information is being read into a processor resource, for example, an instruction cache (204) or a data cache (210), in a processor (202) from an external source, for example, a memory (18), via a system bus (28). (See FIGs. 1 and 3; and column 4, lines 13 through 33.) In fact, the system in Godiwala et al. writes the information to the processor resource regardless of whether any error is detected while being read into the processor resource. In contrast, the apparatus recited in claim 1 operates on information already “stored in a processor resource” and only “between stores of new information in the processor resource.” Nothing in Godiwala et al. teaches or suggests an error detection component operating on information already “stored in a processor resource between stores of new information in the processor

Applicant : **Nhon Quach et al.**
Serial No. : **To Be Assigned (Continuation of 09/608,959)**
Filed : **Concurrently Herewith**
Page No. : **15**

resource,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1, and claims 2 through 10 depending therefrom, is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Section 103 rejection of claim 1, and claims 12 through 14 and 16 that depend therefrom.

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 has been amended to recite *inter alia*: “requesting information from a processor resource by periodically outputting a next-entry-to-read-out signal to the processor resource, when information is not being moved into the processor resource.” Claim 11 is a method claim for operating on information already “stored in a processor resource” and only “between stores of a new information in the processor resource.” Therefore, for at least those reasons given above for claim 1 the Section 103 rejection of claim 11 is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Section 103 rejection of claim 11, and claims 12 through 14 and 16 that depend therefrom.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Godiwala et al. Claim 17 is a machine-readable medium claim and has been amended to include the same elements as in claim 1. Therefore, for at least those reasons given above for claims 1 and 11, the Section 103 rejection of claim 17 is believed to be overcome. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the Section 103 rejection of claim 17, and claims 18 through 20 and 22 that depend therefrom.

The Section 103 rejections of claims 1 through 14, 16 through 20 and 22 are believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a notice of allowance of all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 through 6 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant’s would like to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that claims 3 through 6 are

Applicant : **Nhon Quach et al.**
Serial No. : **To Be Assigned (Continuation of 09/608,959)**
Filed : **Concurrently Herewith**
Page No. : **16**

allowable as written. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that a notice of allowance to that effect be issued.